

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application. All of the claims were rejected. None of the claims is currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office asserts that the reply filed on 12 October 2006 is not fully responsive because it fails to provide arguments that point out the patentable novelty of the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses. At page 10 of the 12 October 2006 reply, Applicant states “with regard to the rejections under §103(a) based on Acharya, the presently claimed invention distinguishes that reference because when the data path does not include forwarding information for the multicast data, the multicast data is broadcast from each port of the router that could possibly be associated with a destination of the multicast data, after which the control path is utilized to determine the subset of ports actually associated with destinations in order to update forwarding tables.” In the same paragraph, Applicant quotes corresponding limitations recited in claim 1: “determining whether a data path within the router includes, in memory, forwarding information for the multicast data which specifically identifies at least one port associated with a destination of the multicast data; if the data path does not include the forwarding information for the multicast data, broadcasting the multicast data from each port of the router that could possibly be associated with a destination of the multicast data; and subsequent to broadcasting the multicast data, determining via a control path which ports of the router are actually associated with a destination of the multicast data, and storing a specific indication of those ports in the memory of the data path.” Each of the independent claims recites a similar limitation to that quoted from claim 1. Because Applicant’s reply first stated the novelty, and subsequently quoted the corresponding language from the claims, the 12 October 2006 reply should be deemed fully responsive with

regard to pointing out the novelty of the claims. Applicant therefore requests that the assertion of non-responsiveness be withdrawn.

Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Neurauter for taking the time to discuss this matter over the telephone. Applicant believes that agreement was reached in that discussion to withdraw the assertion of non-responsiveness in view of the above remarks.

This application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-4001 (X305) so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

2/8/2007

Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-468